

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-12 and 15-17 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, 12, and 15 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 10, 12, and 15 are sought to be amended by the foregoing amendment. These changes are believed to be fully supported by the specification and are not believed to introduce new matter. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the amendments and additions be entered by the Examiner. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the current Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,423,396 to Makimoto et al. (hereinafter "Makimoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,569 to Shen (hereinafter "Shen"). Applicants respectfully traverse based on the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended so that *said first, second, and third portions of the bypass line have a substantially constant trace width*. FIG. 3A illustrates an example of this feature where the trace width of bypass line portions 308, 312, and 318 are all substantially constant. Therefore, the bypass line input and the bypass line output are formed from sections of the bypass line that have the same trace width as the remaining third portion of the bypass line.

In contrast, referring to FIG. 10 of Makimoto, the elements 908 and 909 are mere electrode connections to the transmission line 910 and are not meant to be part of the transmission line 910. This is apparent from FIG. 10 of Makimoto, where the connections nodes have a different width than the transmission line 910, and by the text of Shen which refers to electrodes 808 and 809 as connections to the transmission line 910. (See, Makimoto, col. 5, lines 61-68, note that "electrodes 808 and 809" are assumed to be typos that should be "electrodes 908 and 909", respectively.) Accordingly, the mentioned features of the *first, second, and third portions of the bypass line having a substantially*

constant trace width is not taught or suggested by Makimoto. Furthermore, neither Shen, nor any of the other cited art cures this defect. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a) be removed, and that claims 1 and 10 and their respective dependent claims be passed to allowance. Claims 12 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 7/31/03

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600